



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/330,755	06/11/1999	STUART B. BERMAN	895,080-008	9796
34263 7590 02/09/2009 O'Melveny & Myers LLP IP&T Calendar Department LA-1118 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899				
			EXAMINER JAIN, RAJ K	
			ART UNIT 2416	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/09/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/330,755

**Applicant(s)**

BERMAN, STUART B.

**Examiner**

RAJ JAIN

**Art Unit**

2416

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50, 51 and 53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 50, 51 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 53 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2 replace "adapted to receive" with "receiving". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim(s) 53 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process.

The elements of Claim(s) 53 of "receiving, placing, monitoring and condition of detection..." are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent and further

1) do not tie to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps.

2) do not have a structure required by the claim, or positively recited in the body of the claim in association with a step significant to the inventive concept.

A claim reciting an adequate structural tie must positively recite the structure of another statutory category in association with a step significant to the inventive concept. The following are examples of structural recitations **that do not constitute** adequate structural ties per se: (1) Structure recited in a preamble alone, (2) structure in a phrase expressing intended use or purpose, and (3) structure in a step insignificant to the inventive concept, such as nominal pre or post solution activity.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 50, 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al (USP 5,592,160) in view of Gulick (USP 4,809,269) and further view of Lowell (USP 5,341,476).

Regarding claims 50 and 53, Bennett discloses a method and a port control module (ref. 340) for use in a fiber channel switching fabric comprising (col. 4, lines 22-45): a fiber channel input/output port for connection to a link (col. 1, line 57-col. 2, line 5), an encoder/decoder in communication with the input/output port (col. 2, lines 37-63) where "encoding" and "decoding" indicates the presence of an encoder/decoder, and a

buffer (col. 2, lines 15-22 and col. 4, lines 39-45); where the module places received fiber channel data in the buffer before sending the data to another module (col. 2, lines 15-18), and monitors the buffer for an overflow condition (col. 5, lines 49-66) with an overflow buffer indicating a monitoring of an overflow condition. Bennett also discloses buffer overrun prevention (ref. 436, overflow buffer) (col. 5, lines 58-66).

Bennett does not expressly disclose the inclusion of buffer overrun prevention logic between the encoder/decoder and the buffer, wherein the buffer overrun prevention logic (i) sets tag bits in response to an overrun condition and (ii) operates on the tag bits and not the data bits, (iii) stores tag bits in the buffer with data bits, indicating that the overrun word is to be aborted. Gulick teaches, in a port controller, having buffer overrun prevention logic before the buffer (col. 30, lines 25-39). Since the buffer overrun prevention logic is before the buffer, an obvious place to locate it would be between the buffer and the encoder/decoder. Gulick uses the buffer prevention logic in order to signal the system to terminate a packet that has been corrupted by buffer overflow through the use of tags, where the buffer overrun prevention logic operates on the tag bits and not the data bits (col. 30, lines 34-39, where, during an overrun, "the last byte in the FIFO is tagged as the last byte in the packet," which indicates that the tags are added to the last byte, such that the buffer overrun prevention logic operates on tags and not data and since tag bits indicate an overrun condition). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data communications to include buffer prevention logic before the buffer and to tag words that overrun the buffer, by operating

on tags and not data bits, in order to signal the system to terminate a packet that has been corrupted by buffer overflow.

Bennett in view of Gulick does not expressly disclose the buffer overrun prevention logic tags and to abort words that overrun the buffer. Lowell discloses in a buffering system that a variety of overflow buffer configurations are possible, including a "Reject" type of buffering in which the newest data in the buffer is overwritten by the overflow data and therefore having an abort function (col. 3, lines 31-33; col. 7, lines 4-25, esp. col. 7, lines 15-25; and col. 8, lines 50-66). It is obvious that by using a "Reject" type of buffering that the port control module of Gulick is relieved of the need to terminate packets. Instead, once an overflow is detected, the port control module simply needs to flag the packets that are in overflow and pass the packets to the buffer where all overflowed packets will be terminated when a newer overflowed packet overwrites it. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the buffer overrun prevention logic tag, but not terminate, words that overrun the buffer in order to relieve the prevention logic of the task of terminating the packet before it reaches the buffer.

Regarding claim 51, Bennett in view of Gulick in further view of Lowell discloses that the buffer is FIFO (Bennett: col. 2, lines 60-63; Gulick: col. 30 lines 25-27; and Lowell: col. 7, lines 15-20).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 50, 51 and 53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAJ JAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***/Raj K. Jain/***

Examiner, Art Unit 2416